

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 314

July 20, 1995, 4:03 p.m.
Page S-10380 Temp. Record

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS/104th Congress' Priorities

SUBJECT: Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1995 . . . H.R. 1854. Dole perfecting amendment No. 1807 to the Feingold amendment No. 1803.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 91-8

SYNOPSIS: As reported, H.R. 1854, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1995, will appropriate \$2.19 billion, which is \$200.4 million (8.4 percent) less than was appropriated in fiscal year 1995, and which is 16 percent less than the President's request. The Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) will be abolished, the General Accounting Office will be cut by 25 percent over 2 years, and Senate committee funding will be reduced by 15 percent.

The Feingold amendment would express the sense of the Senate that "as soon as possible before the conclusion of the 104th Congress, the United States Senate should consider comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation that will increase the competitiveness and fairness of elections to the United States Senate."

The Dole perfecting amendment to the Feingold amendment would strike all after the first word of the Feingold amendment and would insert that it is the sense of the Senate that "before the conclusion of the 104th Congress, comprehensive welfare reform, food stamp reform, Medicare reform, Medicaid reform, Superfund reform, wetlands reform, reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act, reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act, immigration reform, Davis-Bacon reform, State Department reauthorization, Bosnia arms embargo, foreign aid reauthorization, fiscal year 1996 and 1997 Agriculture appropriations, Commerce, Justice State appropriations, Defense appropriations, District of Columbia appropriations, Energy and Water Development appropriations, Foreign Operations, Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations, Legislative Branch appropriations, Military Construction appropriations, Transportation appropriations, Treasury and Postal appropriations, and Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies appropriations, reauthorization of the Older Americans Act, reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, health care reform, comprehensive campaign finance reform, job training reform, child support enforcement reform, tax reform, and a "Farm Bill" should be considered."

NOTE: The Senate had earlier failed to table the Feingold amendment (see vote No. 313). Following the vote, the Feingold

(See other side)

YEAS (91)				NAYS (8)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republican (54 or 100%)		Democrats (37 or 82%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (8 or 18%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchison	Akaka	Heflin		Breaux		Inouye- ²
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Baucus	Johnston		Bumpers		
Bennett	Jeffords	Biden	Kennedy		Dodd		
Bond	Kassebaum	Bingaman	Kerrey		Hollings		
Brown	Kempthorne	Boxer	Kerry		Mikulski		
Burns	Kyl	Bradley	Kohl		Moseley-Braun		
Campbell	Lott	Bryan	Lautenberg		Sarbanes		
Chafee	Lugar	Byrd	Leahy		Simon		
Coats	Mack	Conrad	Levin				
Cochran	McCain	Daschle	Lieberman				
Cohen	McConnell	Dorgan	Moynihan				
Coverdell	Murkowski	Exon	Murray				
Craig	Nickles	Feingold	Nunn				
D'Amato	Packwood	Feinstein	Pell				
DeWine	Pressler	Ford	Pryor				
Dole	Roth	Glenn	Reid				
Domenici	Santorum	Graham	Robb				
Faircloth	Shelby	Harkin	Rockefeller				
Frist	Simpson		Wellstone				
Gorton	Smith						
Gramm	Snowe						
Grams	Specter						
Grassley	Stevens						
Gregg	Thomas						
Hatch	Thompson						
Hatfield	Thurmond						
Helms	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

amendment, as amended, by voice vote.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

Argument 1:

If Senators were attempting to gauge if they have enough votes to dictate when the Senate will begin considering campaign finance reform, they must now be disappointed because 41 Senators voted against the Feingold amendment. They therefore do not have cloture strength over the schedule with this issue. We do not oppose campaign finance reform; many of us have sponsored such reform bills in the past. However, as we explained on the previous vote, we have many other urgent legislative items to consider as well. We voted against the Feingold amendment because we did not want to leave the impression that we thought that campaign finance reform was the most urgent issue for us to consider. The Dole amendment, though, accurately expresses our opinion. It lists many items, including campaign finance reform, that should be considered this Congress. We urge all Senators to vote in favor of the Dole amendment.

Argument 2:

The vote on the Feingold amendment was very gratifying. We are pleased that a strong, bipartisan majority of Senators believe this issue should be addressed this Congress. The McConnell substitute amendment to the Feingold amendment, which was withdrawn, listed various legislative items that should be considered this Congress, but did not mention campaign finance reform. The Dole amendment which is now pending also gives a list of items for consideration, but it includes campaign finance reform. We are delighted that the Majority Leader has indicated, with this amendment, that such reform should be brought up this Congress. We do not object to the amendment also listing other legislative items for consideration; certainly, this Congress has been active and will continue to be active across a broad legislative front. We therefore urge adoption of this amendment.

No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.